

1 Cliff Palefsky (SBN 77683)
Keith Ehrman (SBN 106985)
2 MCGUINN, HILLSMAN & PALEFSKY
3 535 Pacific Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
4 Telephone: (415) 421-9292
Facsimile: (415) 403-0202
5 CP@mhpsf.com
keith@mhpsf.com

6
7 Michael Rubin (SBN 80618)
Connie K. Chan (SBN 284230)
Raphael N. Rajendra (SBN 255096)
8 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
177 Post Street, Suite 300
9 San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 421-7151
10 Facsimile: (415) 362-8064
mrubin@altber.com
11 cchan@altber.com
rrajendra@altber.com
12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

13 Mark G. Kisicki, Esq. (SBN 150057)
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART
14 Esplanade Center III, Suite 800
2415 East Camelback Road
15 Phoenix, AZ 85016
Telephone: (602) 778-3700
16 Facsimile: (602) 778-3750
Mark.Kisicki@ogletreedeakins.com
17 *Attorney for Defendant*

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

19 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 PETER SCHUMAN, an individual, and
21 WILLIAM COPLIN, an individual, on behalf
of themselves and on behalf of others similarly
22 situated,

23 **Plaintiffs,**

24 **v.**

25 MICROCHIP TECHNOLOGY
INCORPORATED, a corporation; ATMEL
CORPORATION, a corporation; and ATMEL
26 CORPORATION U.S. SEVERANCE
GUARANTEE BENEFIT PROGRAM, an
27 employee benefit plan,

28 **Defendants.**

Case No. 4:16-cv-05544-HSG

CLASS ACTION

**STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

Hearing Date: February 9, 2017
Time: 2:00pm
Courtroom: 10
Action Filed: September 29, 2016
Trial Date: None

1 Defendants Microchip Technology Incorporated (“Microchip”), Atmel Corporation
2 (“Atmel”), and Atmel Corporation U.S. Severance Guarantee Benefit Program (“Severance
3 Program” and, collectively with Microchip and Atmel, “Defendants”) filed their Motion to
4 Dismiss Plaintiff’s Class Action Complaint and Motion to Dismiss Defendants Microchip and
5 Atmel Corporation U.S. Severance Guarantee Benefit Program as Defendants on November 16,
6 2016. Hearing on this motion is scheduled for February 17, 2017, at 2:00pm.

7 Plaintiffs Peter Schuman and William Coplin (collectively “Plaintiffs”) and Defendants
8 have agreed to extend the deadline for Plaintiffs to respond to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss.
9 Plaintiff’s Opposition will be due on December 21, 2016. Defendants’ Reply will be due on
10 January 4, 2017.

11 Dated: November 29, 2016

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH,
SMOAK, & STEWART, P.C.
Attorneys for Defendants

13
14 By: /s/ Mark G. Kisicki


15 McGUINN, HILLSMAN & PALEFSKY and
16 ALTSCHULER BERZON LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

17
18 By: /s/ Cliff Palefsky

19 IT IS SO ORDERED that:

- 20 1. Plaintiff’s Opposition shall be filed no later than December 21, 2016; and
21 2. Defendant’s Reply shall be filed no later than January 4, 2017.
22

23 Dated: November 30, 2016


JUDGE HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA